



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/069,603	02/28/2002	Kyoko Kobayashi	0992-0128P	3606
2292 7590 07/07/2008 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER				
VO, HAI				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/07/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/069,603

Applicant(s)

KOBAYASHI ET AL.

Examiner

Hai Vo

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-12, 15-18, 20-34, 36, 38-40 and 52-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 53-57 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-12, 15-18, 20-34, 36, 38-40, 52 and 58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1794

1. All of the art rejections are maintained.
2. The obviousness-type double patenting rejections are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4-12, 15-18, 20-34, 36, 38-40, 52 and 58 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 974 617 in view of EP 976 782.

Yorita et al (US 6,303,666) ("Yorita") is relied on as an equivalent form of EP 976 782. EP'617 teaches a laminate for use in glass run channels comprising a core and a skin member being bonded to the core. EP'617 teaches the skin member made of an ultrahigh molecular weight polyolefin having an intrinsic viscosity within the claimed range [0103]. EP'617 also teaches the skin member comprising an olefin thermoplastic elastomer and at least one kind of lubricant recited by the claims (abstract). EP'617 also teaches the olefin thermoplastic elastomer used in the skin layer comprising a mixture of the crystalline polyolefin resin and the rubber to a dynamic heat treatment [0071] in the presence of a cross-linking agent (abstract). EP'617 teaches the core being an olefin thermoplastic elastomer. EP'617 is silent as to the core being a foamed body of the olefin thermoplastic elastomer. Yorita, however, teaches a production of expanded olefinic thermoplastic elastomer for use in weather strip sponges (column 27, line 49). Yorita teaches the weather strip

sponge comprising a foamed body made of a thermoplastic elastomer (A-3) and the olefinic plastic (B) in proportions of from 50-99 parts by weight and 1 to 50 parts by weight respectively (column 13, lines 5-15) wherein the thermoplastic elastomer (A-3) comprises a crosslinked olefin copolymer (a) and a decomposable olefin plastic (b) (column 8, lines 20-25).

Yorita (US'666)***Claimed invention***

Crosslinked olefinic copolymer (A-3)(a)

ethylene/ α -olefin copolymer (a-2)

Olefinic plastic (B)

polyethylene resin (a-1)

Yorita discloses the cross-linked olefinic copolymer (A-3)(a) and a decomposable olefinic plastic resin (A-3)(b) are subjected to dynamic crosslinking in the presence of a crosslinking agent. Yorita teaches the olefinic plastic (B) is added to the admixture ((A-3)(a) and (A-3)(b)) **after** the cross-linked olefinic copolymer (A-3)(a) is already prepared so as to eliminate the thermal decomposition and crosslinking of olefinic copolymer A-3)(a) by heat, thereby obtaining an expanded product as intended (column 13, lines 25-35). Since the olefinic copolymer (A-3)(a) is already crosslinked before kneaded under heat with the olefinic plastic (B), no cross-linking agents are required when the admixture of the olefinic plastic (B) and the crosslinked olefinic copolymer (A-3)(a) are subjected to the dynamic heat treatment. The recitation "the ethylenic thermoplastic elastomer (A) has no crosslinking prior to dynamic heat treatment" does not necessarily indicate that none of the components (a-1) and (a-2) would be cross-linked, but rather the crosslinking between the components is not activated because of the absence of a crosslinking

agent. To the examiner's interpretation, the recitation does not exclude an embodiment wherein the ethylenic thermoplastic elastomer (A) could have one crosslinked component and the crosslinking between the crosslinked component and other components is not activated due to the absence of a cross-linking agent. Yorita teaches the weather strip sponge comprising a foamed body made of a thermoplastic elastomer (A) and the olefinic plastic (B) in proportions of from 50-99 parts by weight and 1 to 50 parts by weight respectively (column 13, lines 5-15) wherein the thermoplastic elastomer (A) comprises a crosslinked olefin copolymer (a) and a decomposable olefin plastic (b) (column 8, lines 20-25). Yorita teaches the crosslinked olefin copolymer (a) having the composition and a Mooney viscosity as required by the claims (column 7, lines 60-65; column 8, lines 10-15). Yorita teaches the olefinic plastic (B) being a homogeneous polyethylene resin or homogeneous polypropylene resin (column 12, lines 37-45). Yorita teaches the expanded olefinic thermoplastic elastomer product comprising 2 parts by weight of the foaming agent (table 3). Table 1 of Yorita shows that the expanded olefinic thermoplastic elastomer product having the foaming expansion ratio of 2 times. Yorita teaches the a decomposable olefin plastic (b) comprising a polypropylene resin or a polypropylene/alpha-olefin copolymer in an amount of 5 to 40 parts by weight based on 100 parts by weight of the crosslinked thermoplastic elastomer (a) and the decomposable olefin plastic (b) (column 8, lines 20-25, 43 and 59). Likewise, the polypropylene resin (b) is present in an amount of 2.5 to 20 parts by weight based on 100 parts by weight of the olefinic thermoplastic elastomer (a

combination of (a), (b) and (B)). This reads on Applicant's polypropylene resin (a-3) in an amount of 30 parts by weight or less per 100 parts by weight of total sum of the polyethylene resin (a-1) and the copolymer based on ethylene/alpha-olefin (a-2). Similarly, this reads on Applicant's olefinic thermoplastic resin (K) in an amount of 1-20 parts by weight or less per 100 parts by weight of the olefinic thermoplastic elastomer (J). It appears that Yorita uses the olefin thermoplastic elastomer having the composition with the amount of each individual component similar to that of the present invention. Therefore, it is the examiner's position that the compression set and melt flow rate of the olefinic thermoplastic elastomer of the expanded product would be inherently present. This is in line with *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ 2d 1655 (1990) which holds that products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties. Yorita teaches the expanded olefinic thermoplastic elastomer products excellent in flexibility, heat resistance, which is important to expectation of successfully practicing the invention of EP'617, thus further suggesting the modification. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the core of EP'617 with the expanded olefinic thermoplastic elastomer product as taught by Yorita motivated by the desire to provide the glass run channel excellent in flexibility, and heat resistance.

Yorita teaches the expanded olefinic thermoplastic elastomer comprising 5 to 80 parts by weight of a softening agent per 100 parts by weight of the sum of crosslinked olefin copolymer (a) and the decomposable olefin plastic (b) to make it

possible to sufficiently improve the flowability of the thermoplastic elastomer without reducing the heat resistance and tensile characteristics of an expanded product (column 9, lines 60-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the softening agent in the foam core motivated by the desire to provide improved flowability of the thermoplastic elastomer without reducing the heat resistance and tensile characteristics of the core.

EP' 617 does not teach how the substrate layer laminated to the skin layer. However, it is a product-by-process limitation not as yet shown to produce a patentably distinct article. It is the examiner's position that the article of EP'617 and Yorita is identical to or only slightly different than the claimed article prepared by the method of the claim, because both articles are formed from the same materials, having structural similarity. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or an obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The burden has been shifted to the applicant to show unobvious differences between the claimed product and the prior art product. *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289,291 (Fed. Cir. 1983). It is noted that if the applicant intends to rely on Examples in the specification or in a submitted Declaration to show non-obviousness, the applicant

should clearly state how the Examples of the present invention are commensurate in scope with the claims and how the Comparative Examples are commensurate in scope with EP'617 as modified by Yorita.

5. The art rejections have been maintained for the following reasons. Applicants contend that the combined teachings of EP'617 and Yorita does not teach the claimed invention because none of the these references teach or suggest an uncrosslinked olefinic thermoplastic elastomer composition in the foamed core. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Yorita discloses the cross-linked olefinic copolymer (A-3)(a) and a decomposable olefinic plastic resin (A-3)(b) are subjected to dynamic crosslinking in the presence of a crosslinking agent. Yorita teaches the olefinic plastic (B) is added to cross-linked olefinic copolymer (A-3) so as to eliminate the thermal decomposition and crosslinking of olefinic copolymer (A-3)(a) by heat, thereby obtaining an expanded product as intended (column 13, lines 25-35). This at least implies that there is no crosslinking between the olefinic copolymer (A-3) and the olefinic plastic (B), thereby forming the expanded product that is made from an uncrosslinked ethylenic thermoplastic elastomer. The examiner notes that nothing in the claims requires a uncrosslinked copolymer (a-2). Table 1 of Yorita shows that the expanded olefinic thermoplastic elastomer product having the foaming expansion ratio of at least 2 times. Accordingly, the art rejections are sustained.
6. Claims 4-12, 15-18, 20-34, 36, 38-40, 52 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 1 095 764 in view of EP 976 782. Kobayashi et al (US 6,589,664) and Yorita et al (US 6,303,666) are relied on as an

equivalent form of EP 1 095 764 and EP 976 782 respectively. Kobayashi teaches a laminate for use in gaskets comprising a core and a skin being bonded to the core. Kobayashi teaches the core and the skin made from the compositions set forth in the claims (abstract). Kobayashi is silent as to the core being a foamed body of the olefin thermoplastic elastomer. Yorita, however, teaches a production of expanded olefinic thermoplastic elastomer for use in gaskets (column 27, line 49). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to foam the core of Kobayashi motivated by the desire to provide the gasket having good external appearance, flexibility and heat resistance.

7. The art rejections over EP 1 095 764 in view of EP 976 782 have been maintained for the following reasons. The statement evidencing common ownership is not sufficient to overcome the finding of obviousness because EP'764 is available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)/ §103 (c). A certified translation of the foreign priority paper is effective to overcome this rejection. Alternatively, the rejection may also be overcome by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another".

Double Patenting

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g.,

Art Unit: 1794

In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 4-12, 15-18, 20-34, 36, 38-40, 52 and 58 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,589,664 in view of Yorita et al (US 6,303,666). See obviousness rational in paragraph no. 6 above. The obviousness-type double patenting rejections will not be withdrawn until the submission of the terminal disclaimer.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action

Art Unit: 1794

is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1485. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, from 9:00 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on (571) 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1794

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hai Vo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794